

REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the attention accorded to the instant application, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the application as amended.

Claims 1 and 3-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 15 and 20 have been amended to recite a sealed cavity between the optical panel and one face of a light control device. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the application generally, page 8 lines 10-27 specifically. No new matter has been added through these amendments.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-15 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,095,457 (hereinafter, "Chou").

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,445,373 (hereinafter, "Yamamoto").

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view of Yamamoto and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,545,732 (hereinafter, "Nakano").

Claims 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,150,557 (hereinafter, "Chen").

In view of the following remarks, Applicants request further examination and reconsideration of the present patent application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-15 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Chou.

Chou discloses and teaches an LCD television with a detachable backlight module which can be removed. See Column 2 line 59 to Column 3 line 7 of Chou. The screen of the LCD

television comprises a protective film, a prism and a diffusion film. See Column 3 lines 3-9 of Chou. Upon removal of the detachable backlight module the rear face of the single, multi-layered screen is exposed to the module cavity and the ambient air. See Column 3 lines 3-15 and Figure 2 of Chou. Chou does not teach or disclose a sealed cavity formed between one face of an optical panel and one face of a light control device. Further Chou does not teach or disclose an optical panel and light control device as being two different elements.

Thus, Chou is not an anticipatory reference because it does not disclose all elements of Claims 1, 15, 20 and all claims depending therefrom of the present application. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-15 and 18-20 is respectfully requested. Issuance of Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-15 and 18-20 is earnestly solicited.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view of Yamamoto.

The deficiencies of Chou are stated above; Yamamoto does not cure these deficiencies. The combination of Chou and Yamamoto would not render the claimed invention obvious.

Yamamoto teaches a removable light source unit, which, after unscrewing can be removed, an optical panel which is secured to the frame and a LCD screen which is affixed to the front of the frame. See Column 6 lines 43-67 of Yamamoto. The combination of Chou and Yamamoto does not teach or suggest an optical panel forming a wall means of a bay which forms a sealed cavity between the optical panel and one face of a light control device, which is recited in Claim 1 of the application, from which Claim 5 depends.

Neither the Chou nor the Yamamoto reference teach an optical panel forming a wall

means of a bay which forms a sealed cavity between the optical panel and one face of a light control device. Therefore, the combination of Chou and Yamamoto does not teach an optical panel forming a wall means of a bay which forms a sealed cavity between the optical panel and one face of a light control device, which is recited in Claim 1 of the application, from which Claim 5 depends. Thus, the combination of Chou and Yamamoto does not render the claimed invention obvious. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 5 is respectfully requested. Issuance of Claim 5 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view of Yamamoto and in further view of Nakano.

The deficiencies of Chou and Yamamoto are stated above; Nakano does not cure these deficiencies. The combination of Chou, Yamamoto and Nakano would not render the claimed invention obvious.

Nakano teaches the use of rubber separators to hold fluorescent lamps in an exact position away from a frame in the backlight assembly of a liquid crystal display. See Column 2 line 60 to Column 3 line 4 of Nakano. The combination of Chou, Yamamoto and Nakano does not teach or suggest an optical panel forming a wall means of a bay which forms a sealed cavity between the optical panel and one face of a light control device, which is recited in Claim 1 of the application, from which Claim 6 depends.

Neither the Chou, the Yamamoto nor the Nakano reference teach an optical panel forming a wall means of a bay which forms a sealed cavity between the optical panel and one face of a light control device. Thus, the combination of Chou, Yamamoto and Nakano does not teach or suggest an optical panel forming a wall means of a bay which forms a sealed cavity

between the optical panel and one face of a light control device, which is recited in Claim 1 of the application, from which Claim 6 depends. Thus, the combination of Chou, Yamamoto and Nakano does not render the claimed invention obvious. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 6 is respectfully requested. Issuance of Claim 6 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chou in view of Chen.

The deficiencies of Chou are stated above; Chen does not cure these deficiencies. The combination of Chou and Chen would not render the claimed invention obvious.

Chen teaches a backlight module which houses fluorescent lamps between two optical panels, which are affixed to the frame of the backlight module. See Column 3 lines 12 to 38 of Chen. Upon removal of the backlight module, including the two optical panels, the inner face of the liquid crystal display will be exposed to the ambient air. The combination of Chou and Chen does not teach or suggest an optical panel forming a wall means of a bay which forms a sealed cavity between one face of the optical panel and one face of a light control device, which is recited in Claim 15 of the application, from which Claims 16 and 17 depend.

Neither Chou nor Chen teach an optical panel forming a wall means of a bay which forms a sealed cavity between the optical panel and one face of a light control device. Thus, the combination of Chou and Chen does not teach or suggest an optical panel forming a wall means of a bay which forms a sealed cavity between one face of the optical panel and one face of a light control device, which is recited in Claim 15 of the application, from which Claims 16 and 17 depends. Thus, the combination of Chou and Chen does not render the claimed invention obvious. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 16 and 17 is respectfully requested. Issuance of

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
EXAMINING GROUP: 2871**

Claims 16 and 17 is earnestly solicited.

Applicant believes that the paper submitted herein provides a complete response to the Office Action, and the present case is in condition for allowance. Therefore, in view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of all rejections, and allowance of all pending claims in due course. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with the Applicants attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned, Applicant's attorney, at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Esatto, Jr.
Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza - Ste. 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343
PJE:DRB/vh